

Appln No. 10/634,640  
Amdt date February 13, 2007  
Reply to Office action of October 13, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6-14 and 22-30 are pending in the application. Although the Office Action Summary lists claims 6-12 as rejected, only claims 6, 9, 10, and 12 are discussed in the Detailed Action. No mention is made of claims 7, 8, and 11 in the Detailed Action. Claims 13, 12 and 22-30 are indicated to be allowable.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and for the courtesy extended during a telephone call on February 12, 2007. The Examiner confirmed that claims 7, 8 and 11 are objected to because they depend from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, just as stated in the Office action dated May 31, 2006. In view of the present amendments made to the claims, Applicants assume that 7, 8, and 11 are now allowable.

#### Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 6, 9, 10, and 12 to correct Markush group language issues that were inadvertently created when the limitations of base claim 1 were copied into the corresponding dependent claims 6, 9, 10 and 12. No new matter was added, and the scope of the claims has not been changed by these amendments. Entry of the claim amendments is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections Under § 112


Claims 6, 9, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as purportedly being indefinite. Applicants traverse the rejections and submit that the rejections are obviated by the amendments to the claims. Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejections are requested.

Appln No. 10/634,640  
Amdt date February 13, 2007  
Reply to Office action of October 13, 2006

Accordingly, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Robert P. Auerbach

Reg. No. 46,525

626/795-9900

RPA/rpa

LAL PAS723191.1-\*02/13/07 12:04 PM